

331.1M3
S79r
1886-90
B

[First annual report]

HOUSE No. 45.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

STATE BOARD OF ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION,
BOSTON, Jan. 31, 1887.

Hon. CHARLES J. NOYES,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SIR: — We have the honor to submit herewith the Annual Report of the State Board of Arbitration and Conciliation.

Very respectfully,

WESTON LEWIS.
RICHARD P. BARRY.
CHARLES H. WALCOTT.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

STATE BOARD OF ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION.

The State Board of Arbitration and Conciliation submits this its first annual report.

Arbitration, as a means of settling differences between employers and their employees, and preventing, to some extent, strikes and lockouts, has for a long time met with favor at the hands of impartial students of the problems arising from the interdependence in our times of labor and capital. With commendable willingness to adopt any practicable measure which promised relief, the last General Court, after much careful deliberation, gave its sanction to the principle of arbitration, and provided by law for the creation of a State Board to be composed of members appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Council. By this action of their representatives the people of the Commonwealth expressed in a significant manner their belief that the welfare of the whole community is involved in the settlement of controversies that shake our great industries to their foundations. In case of disagreement between an employer and any considerable number of workmen, the law of the State provides an impartial tribunal specially constituted to pass upon such questions and without expense to the parties. The only conditions are that the peace be preserved and the work go on as usual. The experience of this Board in the five months which have elapsed since its organization could not be expected to furnish sufficient opportunity for testing to the full its capacity for doing good work. But it is conceived that, even in this short time, a sal

utary influence has been exerted which, if wisely continued, will tend to establish a better understanding between wage-workers and their employers and give a permanent business status to the Board.

The Board has sought to conduct its business in a practical way, avoiding elaborate rules and, so far as possible, technical formalities, with the single purpose of arriving at the most equitable result in the particular case under consideration for the time being. The public hearings have been orderly, and those who have had occasion to present facts or arguments to the Board have not shown any lack of that respect which should properly be accorded to a board of State officials. By reason of the peculiar nature of the controversies that come within the purview of the statute, and a natural unwillingness to bring private business matters before the public gaze, the Board has been compelled to pursue investigations independently of the parties relative to wages paid or customs practised in places or factories other than the one in question. Information of great value has been obtained by this method of inquiry which could not have been obtained except by an impartial, independent board acting under the authority of the State. It should, however, be observed that this course of proceeding involves great labor and expenditure of time in going about from place to place, and it has been found necessary, for a reasonably prompt and intelligent despatch of business, to employ an agent for the purpose of obtaining such information for the use of the Board. The services of a stenographer to report testimony and arguments at public hearings have been deemed indispensable. Soon after the organization of the Board, a circular was prepared and sent by mail to every person, firm or corporation engaged in manufacturing in the State, and employing not less than twenty-five persons. To assist in this work lists were prepared at the request of the Board from unpublished statistics in the possession of the Bureau of Statistics of Labor. These lists comprised 2,077 establishments, each employing twenty-five workers and upwards; and the total number of employees in these establishments is 238,884, or about two-thirds of the whole number of persons employed in manufacturing industries in this State.

The circular referred to was as follows:—

Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

STATE BOARD OF ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION,
BOSTON, Sept. 6, 1886.

All manufacturers and other employers of labor, all employees and labor organizations throughout the Commonwealth, are respectfully invited to give careful consideration to the provisions of the following act, passed at the last session of the General Court. The obvious intent of the statute is to provide a means of settling differences between employers and employees in an amicable manner, and so to avoid, as far as possible, the engendering of hostile feeling, and prevent the recurrence of losses and suffering such as have been endured in the past by communities in which recourse has been had to strikes, lockouts and boycotting for the purpose of settling disputes.

AN ACT TO PROVIDE FOR A STATE BOARD OF ARBITRATION FOR
THE SETTLEMENT OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EMPLOYERS AND
THEIR EMPLOYEES.

Be it enacted, etc., as follows:

SECTION 1. The governor, with the advice and consent of the council, shall, on or before the first day of July in each year, appoint three competent persons to serve as a State Board of Arbitration and Conciliation in the manner hereinafter provided. One of them shall be an employer or selected from some association representing employers of labor, one of them shall be selected from some labor organization and not an employer of labor, the third shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the other two: *provided, however*, that if the two appointed do not agree on the third man at the expiration of thirty days, he shall then be appointed by the governor. They shall hold office for one year or until their successors are appointed, and if a vacancy occurs, the governor, in the same manner, shall appoint some one to serve out the unexpired term, and may in like manner remove any member of said board. The members of said board shall, before entering upon the duties of their office, be sworn to a faithful discharge thereof. They shall at once organize by the choice of one of their number as chairman, and one as clerk of said board.

SECT. 2. The board shall, as soon as possible after its organization, establish such rules of procedure as shall be approved by the governor and council.

SECT. 3. Whenever any controversy or difference, not involving questions which may be the subject of a suit at law or bill in equity, exists between an employer, whether an individual, copartnership or corporation, and his employees, if at the time he employs not less than twenty-five persons in the same general line of business in any city or town in this Commonwealth, the board shall, upon application as hereinafter provided, and as soon as practicable thereafter, visit the locality of the dispute and make careful inquiry into the cause thereof, hear all persons interested therein who may come before them, advise the respective parties what, if anything, ought to be done or submitted to by either or both to adjust said dispute, and make a written decision thereof. This decision shall at once be made public, shall be recorded upon proper books of record to be kept by the clerk of said board, and a short statement thereof published in the annual report hereinafter provided for, and the said board shall cause a copy thereof to be filed with the clerk of the city or town where said business is carried on.

SECT. 4. Said application shall be signed by said employer, or by a majority of his employees in the department of the business in which the controversy or difference exists, or their duly authorized agent or by both parties, and shall contain a concise statement of the grievances complained of, and a promise to continue on in business or at work without any lockout or strike until the decision of said board, if it shall be made within three weeks of the date of filing said application. Immediately upon the receipt of said application the clerk of said board shall cause public notice to be given of the time and place for hearing. Should the petitioner or petitioners fail to perform the promise made therein, the board shall proceed no further thereupon without the written consent of the adverse party.

SECT. 5. Upon the receipt of such application and after such notice the board shall proceed as before provided, and render a written decision, which shall be open to public inspection, shall be recorded upon the records of the board and published at the discretion of the same in an annual report to be made to the General Court on or before the first day of February in each year.

SECT. 6. Said decision shall be binding upon the parties who join in said application for six months, or until either party has given the other notice in writing of his intention not to be bound by the same at the expiration of sixty days therefrom. Said notice may be given to said employees by posting the same in three conspicuous places in the shop or factory where they work.

SECT. 7. The parties to any controversy or difference, as provided in section three of this act, may agree upon a board of arbitration and conciliation who shall, in the matters referred to them, have and

exercise all the powers which the State board might have and exercise; and their jurisdiction of the matters referred to them shall be exclusive, except that they may ask and receive the advice and assistance of the State board in the disposition of the matters submitted to them for their determination. The report of any board constituted under the provisions of this section shall at once be filed with the clerk of the city or town in which the controversy or difference arose, and a copy thereof shall be forwarded to the State board.

SECT. 8. The arbitrators hereby created shall be paid five dollars a day for each day of actual service, and their necessary travelling and other expenses, to be paid out of the treasury of the Commonwealth.

SECT. 9. This act shall take effect upon its passage. [*Approved June 2, 1886. Chap. 263.*]

The Board consists of Weston Lewis of Boston, Richard P. Barry of Lynn, and Charles H. Walcott of Concord, and has organized by the choice of Weston Lewis as chairman and Richard P. Barry as clerk.

Applications may be presented to any member of the Board at any time. Printed forms of application may be obtained at the rooms of the Board, No. 13 Beacon Street, Boston, or of the clerk, or of any other member of the Board. Applications in any other form will be received and acted on, if they follow substantially the requirements of the statute; but the use of the printed forms is recommended, as tending to promote regularity and uniformity in the transaction of business with the Board.

Mr. Lewis's address is 81 Worcester Street, or 56 Summer Street, Boston; Mr. Barry's, 40 Smith Street, or 8 Munroe Street, Lynn; Mr. Walcott's, Concord, or 4 Pemberton Square, Boston.

By order of the Board,

WESTON LEWIS,
Chairman.

RICHARD P. BARRY, *Clerk.*

The first application for the advice and assistance of the Board was received from Chelsea, under circumstances which appear in the following decision of the Board, made public on Oct. 4, 1886:—

*In the Matter of the Petition of Charles H. Litchman, in behalf of
Employees of T. Martin & Bro. of Chelsea.*

In this case the application was signed by Charles H. Litchman, described as a member of one of the executive boards of the organization known as the Knights of Labor, and alleged, among other things,

that a controversy existed at Chelsea, in this Commonwealth, between T. Martin & Bro., manufacturers of elastic web, and their employees, in relation to "wages and other matters technical to the trade;" and that said Litchman, or the said executive board, was the duly authorized agent of a majority of said employees. The application was filed on Sept. 21, 1886, and notice of a hearing having been given by publication in the newspapers, and by mailing copies of the notice to the parties above named, this Board visited the mills of Messrs. Martin, and had an informal conference with the proprietors. On September 27, pursuant to the notice given, the Board met in the council chamber, at the city hall in Chelsea, for the purpose of hearing all persons interested in the subject matter of the petition.

Many of the operatives in whose behalf the application was made were present in person, and stated their grievances, which were such as might properly be brought before a board of arbitration. The members of the firm of T. Martin & Bro. were present in person, but before the petitioners had been heard, or any evidence taken, the attorney acting for the firm interposed the objection that the Board had no jurisdiction of the matter set forth in the application, "because said application is not signed by the majority of the employees of said T. Martin & Bro., nor by a majority thereof in any department, nor by any duly authorized agent of a majority of said employees in any department of their business." A "protest" was added "against any hearing being had in the premises, except so far as may be necessary to show that neither said Litchman nor said executive board are such agents as alleged in such application." After listening to argument upon these points, the Board decided that, as it would be necessary to pursue the inquiry further, in order to bring out the facts upon which the counsel relied in support of his objections, it would be the fairest course towards all parties, and most in accordance with the spirit of the statute, to hear all who wished to be heard on the matter set forth in the petition, and reserve for further and more careful consideration all the points that might be raised. Upon the announcement of this ruling, T. Martin & Bro. and their attorney withdrew, and the hearing was continued in their absence.

The facts developed by the subsequent inquiry left no doubt that the application was signed by the duly authorized agent of a majority of those persons who were employees of T. Martin & Bro. at the time when the grievances complained of were brought to the notice of the firm. But it also appeared that, in May last, all the persons interested in this application voluntarily ceased to work for the firm, and have not, since that time, done any work for them. With the exception of those who may have found employment elsewhere, they have been on a strike for upwards of four months.

The Board has proceeded thus far in what it conceives to be the true spirit of the statute, and with an earnest desire to do all in its power to effect a conciliation of the parties to this dispute, but it has become necessary for the Board to declare its own construction of the powers given to it by the statute. It is clearly in the interest of all concerned that this law should be administered without undue regard for technicalities, but with an intelligent recognition of such limitations as the Legislature clearly intended to establish. If, in practice, the law is found to be materially defective or unnecessarily obscure, it can be amended only by the authority which enacted it.

In cases clearly within the purview of the statute, the power intrusted to the Board is merely to "advise the respective parties what, if anything, ought to be done or submitted to by either or both to adjust said dispute, and make a written decision thereof." This power is to be exercised only as between an "employer" and "his employees." By the terms of section 4, those who apply to the Board are required to "promise to continue on in business or at work, without any lockout or strike, until the decision of said Board, etc.;" and it is further provided that, "should the petitioner or petitioners fail to perform the promise made therein, the Board shall proceed no further thereupon without the written consent of the adverse party."

It will be perceived that the authority conferred is somewhat peculiar in its character and limited in its operation; and, after careful consideration of the provisions of the statute, the Board is of the opinion that the remedy provided by the existing statute can be applied only between employers of labor and those who, at the time of making the application to the Board, are actually at work for them or in their pay, and in a position to promise as above provided. It appears to be the intent of the statute that strikes and lockouts shall be superseded by arbitration and conciliation, or, to say the least, that the more peaceful method shall be tried in the first instance. This view of the matter receives support from the action of the Board of Arbitration of the State of New York, which in two recent cases declined to intervene in an official capacity until the operatives were back in their places and at work. The New York statute is in some respects different from the one in this State, but it confers more extensive powers than the Legislature has given to this Board.

In the case here presented, the operatives sought the good offices of the Board, and with apparent good faith announced their willingness to submit all their grievances, and to abide by the decision, whether favorable or adverse. The employers, on their part, refused to join in the application when invited so to do, and declined to take part in the proceedings, except as before stated. Their protest we are bound to consider as fully and impartially as if they had

remained throughout the hearing, and had assisted the Board to arrive at a just and equitable solution of the real difficulty in hand. And, therefore, for the reasons above given, the Board is compelled to decide that, under the provisions of the statute, it would not be legally justified in offering its advice to either party.

WESTON LEWIS.

RICHARD P. BARRY.

CHARLES H. WALCOTT.

It should be noted that under this application the Board did not proceed to a consideration of the merits of the controversy, but stopped short at the objection of want of jurisdiction. The principle set forth in the above decision, to wit, that this Board has no power to interpose when either party has struck or is locked out, has been recognized by all who have since applied to the Board for aid or advice. In a subsequent case, the Board declined to entertain an application from workmen until after they had returned to work. They returned promptly to their work, and thereupon the Board proceeded to inquire into the matter in controversy, as provided by the statute.

The result of the strike at the factory of T. Martin & Bro., so far as the Board has any information concerning it, is this: Some of the men and women have returned to work in their former places, by agreement with the manufacturers; some have engaged in the manufacture of elastic goods, on the co-operative plan; others have obtained employment elsewhere.

The second decision of the Board was published on November 1, 1886. The following is a copy:—

In the Matter of the Petition of Henry M. Nelson, in behalf of Employees of Harry H. Hale, doing business under the name of the Groveland Mills.

The application in this case was filed on October 11, 1886, and as soon as practicable the members of the Board visited South Groveland, where the mills are situated, and, by inquiry made upon the spot, satisfied themselves that the application was, in fact, authorized by a majority of the employees of the Groveland Mills, and that the hands were actually at work for their employer. After making all reasonable efforts to obtain an interview with the employer, but without success, notice was given, by publication in newspapers printed

in Haverhill and Boston, of a public hearing at South Groveland, on October 18. At the time and place appointed, and afterward by adjournment, on October 21, the Board met and heard from the petitioners and others interested such arguments and statements of fact as they chose to offer. The employer did not appear at the hearings, — a circumstance greatly regretted by the Board.

The complaint of the petitioners, as set forth in the application, was “that the wages paid in said mills are insufficient, and are lower than the wages paid in the majority of manufacturing establishments of a like nature in Massachusetts and elsewhere in New England.” The hands, being about four hundred in number, were employed in the manufacture of woollen goods, principally flannels; and that there might be the least possible inconvenience to all parties, care was taken, at the request of the Board, that a few only of the operatives should leave their work at a time, and that they should return to their posts as soon as they had been heard. It should be noted that the petitioners in this case have in all respects kept scrupulously within the law, and have not, at any stage of the controversy with their employer, resorted to the expedient commonly known as a strike. But at the close of the hearing on the first day the Board was informed that the mills were shut down, and that there would be no employment for the operatives for an indefinite time. On the following day, however, at the request of the employer, the operatives in the finishing department returned to work, for the purpose of finishing the pieces of goods which were left in such a condition that, without immediate additional labor, they would become damaged or valueless. The request was complied with at once, and unconditionally, and at the time of the second hearing the operatives in this department were still at work.

The terms in which the grievances are expressed in the written application not only raise the question of the sufficiency of the wages paid, and what amount ought in fairness to be allowed, but offer as a test or standard “the wages paid in the majority of manufacturing establishments of a like nature” in New England. In considering this question the Board has sought to corroborate the statements of fact made at the hearings, and to supplement the information received from the operatives by an investigation pursued independently, and to such an extent as was practicable with the limited means at command, and keeping in view the necessity of a prompt determination of the matter submitted. By pursuing this course, the Board has arrived at the conclusions herein set forth, which are based upon information received, in greater or less detail, from seventeen woollen mills in Massachusetts manufacturing goods similar to those made at Groveland; and the Board takes pleasure in stating that its efforts to obtain

from manufacturers outside of Groveland the facts necessary for the formation of an opinion have been met with uniform courtesy and a readiness to give the Board all possible assistance in its work.

The spinners in the Groveland Mills are paid by the day, reckoned at ten hours, and they receive wages varying from \$1.10 to \$1.40, the last-named sum being the highest except in the case of one man who receives \$1.50. It appears that in all the woollen mills of which the Board has received information, the spinners are paid, not as here by the day, but, like the weavers, according to the amount of work actually done by them, — the spinners being usually paid by the run, the weavers by the cut. The latter method of payment appears to be the fairest to the workmen ; but if, for any peculiar reason unknown to this Board, it is considered preferable in the Groveland Mills to pay spinners by the day, the Board is of the opinion that the wages paid should be equalized to such a degree that men of equal skill and doing similar work, both in kind and amount, may receive the same pay for each day's work ; and that, tried by this rule, the sum of \$1.60 per day, with an additional allowance of ten cents to such as exercise any of the functions of an overseer, is not unreasonable, and ought to be granted. For the same or similar reasons the wool-sorters are considered fairly entitled to receive \$1.75 per day, if the practice is continued of paying them by the day instead of by the weight, the latter method appearing to be more advantageous to both employer and workman. The Board is further of the opinion that in these mills the wool-washers ought, in fairness, to receive \$1.40 per day ; competent wool-pickers, \$1.35 per day ; competent piecers, \$1.00 per day ; head stock piecers, \$1.50 per day ; boys and girls in the carding and finishing rooms, 60 cents and 70 cents per day, according to age, skill and experience ; warp-dressers, \$1.80 per day. The prices paid to other operatives, tried by the standard submitted by the petitioners themselves, do not appear to demand any revision by the Board.

The prices recommended above are intended only for a full day's service of a person competent to do the work to which he is assigned. It would be reasonable, and according to the general practice, to allow an additional amount, whenever the character or amount of work done materially and uniformly exceeds that of workers in the same department taken as a class. And, on the other hand, it could not be claimed with reason that those who were learning their trade should receive the pay of a competent workman.

The wages earned in these mills are paid once a month, and it was the unanimously expressed wish of the operatives that their wages be paid them once a week, as is required of corporations. But the employer here is not a corporation, and the demand for weekly pay-

ments was not embodied in the written application. It is not, therefore, necessary to pass upon this part of the case as presented at the hearing.

WESTON LEWIS.

RICHARD P. BARRY.

CHARLES H. WALCOTT.

The lockout at South Groveland continued until November 15. Work was then given to most of the employees, upon their signing a declaration of their "willingness to work at our former wages until such time as our employers shall deem it advisable for their interest and for ours to increase our pay." There has since been an increase in wages, and something done towards correcting the inequalities complained of. Upon the resumption of business, however, four men and one woman who appeared before the Board and testified at the public hearing were denied work, and have not since been employed in these mills.

The following is the third case which came under the consideration of the Board. The decision was rendered on December 16, 1886.

In the Matter of the Petition of William B. Pattison, in behalf of Employees of Sylvester Tower of Cambridge.

The petitioners are employed in making keys and sharps for pianos and organs, and in the manufacture of actions, — that is, the combination of parts of a musical instrument between the keyboard and the hammer. The employees are about one hundred and thirty in number, all told; and grievances are alleged concerning the rate of wages paid; the number of hours required for a week's work; as to the method of payment, whether by the piece or by the day, and the wages of women in comparison with the wages of men. The employer declined to join in the application, and did not appear at the hearing.

An advance in wages is claimed for five men employed in the manufacture of sharps, which are made from logs of ebony. Most of their work is done with saws, and is not only unhealthy, but dangerous. The evidence tended to prove that insufficient precautions have been taken, in this part of the establishment, for carrying off the black dust, or to afford proper ventilation and a reasonable degree of security to the persons of the men employed. They now receive wages varying from \$8 to \$12 per week, and asked for an increase of twenty

per cent., which, if granted, would add to the cost of production about two cents per set, and could not affect injuriously the profits of the business as a whole. Therefore, the Board is of the opinion that for work of this character, performed with the machinery and under the general conditions described by witnesses at the hearing, the wages demanded would not be excessive and ought to be paid.

Sixteen girls and women are employed on certain parts of the action, — a portion of the work which, until recently, was performed by men at a higher rate of wages than is now paid for like services; and it is urged that the women so employed ought, in fairness, to receive as high compensation as is paid to men for work similar in kind, quality and amount. The women here are engaged wholly upon piece work, and the abstract proposition, that a woman who does a man's work and does it as well as he can do it, should receive a man's pay, commends itself strongly to the judgment of the Board; but the women employed in the shop in question did not appear in person at the hearing, nor does it clearly appear that they meant to join in the application as parties aggrieved. The Board, therefore, as the case stands, cannot make any recommendation concerning them.

It is the desire of the petitioners that a week's labor be comprised within fifty-nine hours, by a calculation which allows ten hours each for five days in the week and nine hours for Saturday. The reasonableness of this request is, perhaps, sufficiently shown by the fact that, after application had been made to the Board and notice of a hearing had been ordered, a written notice was posted in the manufactory, presumably by the employer or his agent, stating that thereafter the time would be reduced to fifty-nine hours per week. It is obvious that, to be rightly appreciated, this action on the part of the employer should be understood as an expression of his intention to shorten the time without deduction from the wages of the day hands.

Complaint is made that, in the several departments of this shop, the practice of employing men to work by the day, instead of by the piece, tends to the injury of skilled workmen who have been accustomed to piece work, and that the result of the change which is going on is to reduce the wages of skilled labor by bringing into competition with it the labor of youths who are learning the trade, and therefore are willing to work for a lower compensation. Where piece hands and day hands are employed together on the same branch of work, a desire was generally expressed that they be paid on a uniform plan, — that is, all by the piece or set, or all by the day, — and that setting up the actions should always be paid for by the piece.

The Board has learned, by inquiry made in other well-known manufactories where piano actions are made, that, in some establishments at least, the work is paid for throughout at fixed prices per set; and

this method of payment is thought by those who use it to be the best for all concerned. But it also appears that the practice of action-makers is not uniform in this particular; and since it is admitted that the objections urged in this case against the introduction of day work are founded to some extent upon what, as is feared, will happen in the future, it does not clearly appear in this branch of the case that such a grievance exists at the present time as would warrant any positive recommendation. But if, upon due consideration, the employer should become convinced that the desired change would not work substantial injury to his business, there is reason to believe that the concession would be positively beneficial to all parties, by promoting harmony and good feeling throughout the establishment.

WESTON LEWIS.

RICHARD P. BARRY.

CHARLES H. WALCOTT.

The reduction of the number of hours required for a week's work has proved to be quite as beneficial to the men and women employed in this establishment as was expected. This change was the direct result of the application to the Board, and, in the opinion of the employees' agent, "is worth all the time, expense and labor involved in the controversy." All other matters complained of remain as before.

On December 29, an application was received from South Weymouth, signed by H. B. Reed & Co., manufacturers of boots and shoes, and by David S. Murray, in behalf of the employees of said firm. The decision of the Board, rendered January 29, was as follows:—

In the Matter of the Joint Petition of H. B. Reed & Co. of South Weymouth, and their Employees.

The questions raised on either hand, in this case, relate to prices paid for labor in the manufacture of boots and shoes. Certain "Rules" also are submitted by the workmen for the approval of the Board. Both parties appeared, and after a full hearing the Board made an investigation for itself of prices paid and methods employed in other shops where goods of a similar character are made. Both parties desired that the Board should make such inquiry, and expressed their willingness to abide by the results obtained from competing shops, due allowance being made at all times for substantial differences in methods and machinery used. Few of the more modern improved appliances are used in this shop, and all the work (ex-

cept stitching) to which the following price list applies is done by foot-power. On the evidence adduced at the hearing, supplemented by further information from fourteen separate establishments, the Board hereby recommends the following price list for the shop of H. B. Reed & Co. of South Weymouth:—

PRICE LIST.

CRIMPING.

Not gummed—straight forms—nothing found.

Men's calf boots, black or red side out,	\$0 55
Boys' calf boots, black or red side out,	55
Opera calf boots,	30
Sample calf boots, per pair,	07
Machine crimping, per case,	25

STITCHING BOOTS.

Staying seams,	\$0 10
Stitching California, No. 1,	16
Stitching California, No. 2,	11
Stitching New England and staying, No. 1,	23
Stitching New England, No. 2,	11
Stitching Western, No. 2,	08
Stitching feet-lining on boots,	10
Siding,	13
Turning,	11

STITCHING UPPERS.

Seamless Vamp.

Balmorals, cat-stitched or turned edges, No. 1,	\$2 25
Balmorals, cat-stitched or turned edges, No. 2,	2 00
Balmorals, cat-stitched or turned edges, extension top, No. 1,	2 35
Balmorals, side lace, bound,	2 60
Balmorals, grain, chamois lined,	2 05
Balmorals, grain, bellows tongue,	2 35
Balmorals, overlapped tops,	2 15
Buttons, cat-stitched or turned edges, No. 1,	3 00
Buttons, cat-stitched or turned edges, No. 2,	2 60
Congress, No. 1,	2 00
Congress, No. 2,	1 75
Congress, imitation lace anchor, No. 2,	1 85
Congress, calf lined,	2 25
Congress, back-stay stitched,	2 25
Congress, 4 worked holes, imitation button, No. 2,	2 35
Congress, 7 worked holes, open front, scallop, No. 2,	2 85
Congress, Marshall,	2 50
Balmoral, fancy patent,	1 95
Congress, fancy patent,	2 15

STITCHING UPPERS — *Continued.*

Creedmores, grain, foxed quarter, pinked,	\$2 60
Creedmores, grain, whole quarter,	2 35
Creedmores, Puritan, foxed quarter,	2 40
Creedmores, hair calf lined, extra,	2 65
Creedmores, new pattern,	2 50
Prince Alberts, 3 worked holes, imitation buttons,	1 95
Seamless Oxfords,	1 65
Oxford ties, plain quarter,	1 25
Oxford ties, foxed quarter, bound,	1 75
Oxford ties, side lace,	1 75
Button Oxfords, four worked holes, whole quarter,	1 90
Button Oxfords, four worked holes, foxed quarter, bound,	2 10
Button Oxfords, four worked holes, gore front,	1 90
Button Oxfords, seamless,	1 75
Strap tie,	1 10

EXTRAS.

Zigzag stitch on balmorals,	\$0 50
No. 1 vamp,	10
No. 2 vamp,	10
No. 3 vamp,	15
Machine-punched tips,	15
Folded edges,	10

FITTING SOLES.

Pump or half-double sole, pump soles coated with shellac, No. 1,	\$0 70
Pump or half-double sole, pump soles coated with shellac, No. 2,	60
Sole and long welt, No. 1,	80
Sole and long welt, No. 2,	75
Half-double sole and long welt, No. 1,	95
Half-double sole and long welt, No. 2,	95
Waukenphast, no slip tap, No. 1,	95
Waukenphast, no slip tap, No. 2,	80
Waukenphast and slip tap, No. 1,	1 00
Waukenphast and slip tap, No. 2,	1 00
Tap sole, no welt, No. 1,	85
Tap sole, no welt, No. 2,	75
Tap sole and short welt, No. 1,	1 00
Tap sole and short welt, No. 2,	1 00
Tap sole and long welt, No. 1,	1 00
Tap sole and long welt, No. 2,	1 00
Long tap sole and short welt, No. 1,	1 10
Long tap sole and short welt, No. 2,	1 00
Long tap sole and long welt, No. 1,	1 10
Long tap sole and long welt, No. 2,	1 00
Long tap and sole, No. 1,	1 00
Long tap and sole, No. 2,	90
Double decker, half-double sole, No. 1,	1 15

Double decker, half-double sole, No. 2,	\$1 00
Double decker, sole and slip, No. 1,	1 00
Double decker, sole and slip, No. 2,	90

NAILING BY HAND.

Pump or half-double sole, plain screw, No. 1,	\$0 35
Pump or half-double sole, plain screw, No. 2,	35
Pump or half-double sole, diamond copper nailed, No. 1,	75
Pump or half-double sole, diamond copper nailed, No. 2,	65
Pump or half-double sole, plain centre, copper nailed, No. 1,	60
Pump or half-double sole, plain centre, copper nailed, No. 2,	55
Pump or half-double sole, plain centre, three rows nails, No. 1,	85
Pump or half-double sole, plain centre, three rows nails, No. 2,	75
Double sole, slip and welt nailed with iron nails, plain screw, No. 1,	50
Double sole, slip and welt nailed with iron nails, plain screw, No. 2,	50
Double sole, slip and welt nailed with iron nails, diamond copper nailed, No. 1,	75
Double sole, slip and welt nailed with iron nails, diamond copper nailed, No. 2,	75
Double sole, slip and welt nailed with iron nails, 3 rows, copper nailed, No. 1,	75
Double sole, slip and welt nailed with iron nails, 3 rows, copper nailed, No. 2,	75
Tap sole and welt, plain screw, No. 1,	50
Tap sole and welt, plain screw, No. 2,	50
Tap sole and welt, diamond copper nailed, No. 1,	75
Tap sole and welt, diamond copper nailed, No. 2,	75
Tap sole and welt, 3 rows copper nails, plain centre, No. 1,	80
Tap sole and welt, 3 rows copper nails, plain centre, No. 2,	75
Tap sole and welt, 2 rows copper nails, plain centre, No. 1,	65
Tap sole and welt, 2 rows copper nails, plain centre, No. 2,	65
Long tap sole, plain screw, No. 1,	65
Long tap sole, plain screw, No. 2,	60
Long tap sole, diamond copper nailed, No. 1,	85
Long tap sole, diamond copper nailed, No. 2,	80
Long tap sole, 3 rows copper nails, plain centre, No. 1,	85
Long tap sole, 3 rows copper nails, plain centre, No. 2,	80
Tap sole and welt, grain shoe, 2 rows screws in shank, No. 1,	60
Tap sole and welt, grain shoe, 2 rows screws in shank, No. 2,	60

CHANNELLING, SEWING, ETC

Shoes.

Channelling, No. 1 and No. 2,	\$0 05
Nailing heel-seats, No. 1 and No. 2,	05
Pulling lasts, No. 1 and No. 2,	05
McKay sewing, No. 1,	14
McKay sewing, No. 2,	12
Running out welts, No. 1 and No. 2,	03

Fair stitching, No. 1,	\$0 14
Fair stitching, No. 2,	13
Cutting off stitches, No. 1 and No. 2,	03
Relasting, No. 1 and No. 2,	05
Stitching channels and beating out, No. 1,	20
Stitching channels and beating out, No. 2,	18

Boots.

Same prices as for shoes; and

Turning down tops,	\$0 05
------------------------------	--------

BLOCKING ON HEELS.

California, $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches high, two runners, No. 1,	\$0 45
California, $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches high, two runners, No. 2,	40
Western, $1\frac{1}{4}$ inches high, two runners, No. 1,	45
Western, $1\frac{1}{4}$ inches high, two runners, No. 2,	40
New England, $1\frac{3}{8}$ inches high, two runners, No. 1,	40
New England, $1\frac{3}{8}$ inches high, two runners, No. 2,	40
New England, $1\frac{1}{4}$ inches high, two runners, No. 1,	35
New England, $1\frac{1}{4}$ inches high, two runners, No. 2,	35
Strap shoes, 1 inch high, one runner, No. 1,	35
Strap shoes, 1 inch high, one runner, No. 2,	30
Congress shoes, $1\frac{1}{4}$ inches high, one runner, No. 1,	35
Congress shoes, $1\frac{1}{4}$ inches high, No. 2,	35
Extra for long tap, cutting breast of heel,	08
Extra for driving one row of slugs,	10

Driving seven common slugs included in these prices.

SHAVING HEELS.

Congress, 1 inch high, one runner, No. 1,	\$0 20
Congress, 1 inch high, one runner, No. 2,	15
Congress (high), $1\frac{1}{8}$ inches high, one runner, No. 1,	20
Congress (high), $1\frac{1}{8}$ inches high, one runner, No. 2,	18
New England, $1\frac{1}{4}$ inches high, two runners, No. 1,	20
New England, $1\frac{1}{4}$ inches high, two runners, No. 2,	15
New England (high), $1\frac{3}{8}$ inches high, two runners, No. 1,	20
New England (high), $1\frac{3}{8}$ inches high, two runners, No. 2,	18
R. & F. & Co., $1\frac{1}{8}$ inches high, two runners, No. 1,	20
R. & F. & Co., $1\frac{1}{8}$ inches high, two runners, No. 2,	18
California, $1\frac{1}{2}$ to $1\frac{3}{4}$ inches high, two runners, No. 1,	20
California, $1\frac{1}{2}$ to $1\frac{3}{4}$ inches high, two runners, No. 2,	20
Strap shoes, $\frac{20}{32}$ inch high, one runner, No. 1,	20
Strap shoes, $\frac{20}{32}$ inch high, one runner, No. 2,	15
T. W. shoes, $1\frac{1}{8}$ inches high, two runners, No. 1,	20
T. W. shoes, $1\frac{1}{8}$ inches high, two runners, No. 2,	20

BLOCKING AND SHAVING HEELS.

Hoodlums,	\$1 25
Lines nailed, $1\frac{1}{2}$ rows diamond slugs,	1 10
Waukenphast, 1 row diamond slugs,	1 00

EDGE MAKING.

Pump or half-double sole, No. 1,	\$0 70
Pump or half-double sole, No. 2,	60
Tap sole, no welt, No. 1,	85
Tap sole, no welt, No. 2,	80
Tap sole and welt, No. 1,	90
Tap sole and welt, No. 2,	80
Railroad,	1 40
Stitched aloft, No. 1,	1 25
Stitched aloft, No. 2,	1 15
Cork sole, imitation of tap, No. 1,	1 15
Cork sole, imitation of tap, No. 2,	1 15
Cork sole, imitation of tap, half-double sole, No. 1,	1 10
Cork sole, imitation of tap, half-double sole, No. 2,	85

TREEING.

Men's calf boots,	\$0 60
Boys' calf boots,	50
Men's opera boots,	50
Men's grain Napoleon,	25
Men's calf shoes rubbed once,	20
Men's shoes, dongola, grain and goat, rubbed once,	15
Sample boots, per pair,	06
Sample shoes, per pair,	04

HAND-SEWED BOOTS AND SHOES.

Hand-sewed boots or shoes, No. 1,	\$13 75
---	---------

The following rules agreed to by both parties are approved by the Board:—

RULE I. For all extra work extra compensation shall be received.

RULE II. Should any differences arise hereafter touching any matter not provided for in the foregoing rules, such differences shall go before the local executive board of the Knights of Labor for adjustment and decision.

The other rules presented to the Board are not approved.

WESTON LEWIS.

RICHARD P. BARRY.

CHARLES H. WALCOTT.

The next two applications were received from the city of Lynn,—one from Louis C. T. Schleber, acting in behalf of the employees of Francis W. Breed, and another from Mr. Breed himself,—both, however, presenting in reality different phases of one controversy. Neither party was willing to join

in the petition presented by the other side; but after three days spent in a hearing on the first petition, an understanding was arrived at, in accordance with which both of these *ex parte* applications were placed on file without further action on the part of the Board, and in their stead a joint application signed by Mr. Breed and the agent of his employees was filed. An extended hearing has been had in this case, which is still held by the Board under advisement. The matters involved are deemed to be of the greatest importance to the shoe manufacturers of Lynn, as well as to those whose skilled labor has so largely contributed to the prosperity which has heretofore blessed that city and made it pre-eminent in the shoe manufacturing industry of the country. The questions presented affect two shops only, but the issues have been framed with the expectation that the prices to be paid throughout the city of Lynn for work of the same grade as Mr. Breed's work will be determined by the decision in this case. Hence the importance of the case can hardly be exaggerated.

RECOMMENDATIONS.

1. From the beginning, the Board has been seriously embarrassed for want of a permanent clerk to conduct correspondence, do general office business, and keep the records of the Board's doings. It is obviously impossible for a perambulating board like this to keep in communication with the public, except through a stationary clerk, who may always be found at the rooms of the Board, and in a position to answer inquiries and give such information as may reasonably be expected by the public and all persons having business with the Board. The requirement of the statute that a member of the Board shall be chosen clerk has been shown by experience to be ill adapted to the actual necessities of the business to be done, and incompatible with the performance of other duties required of the member so chosen.

2. A further recommendation is made that the Board be given a discretionary power to summon witnesses and to examine them under oath.

3. The statute requires that the written application to the Board shall contain "a promise to continue on in business or at work without any lockout or strike until the decision of said

Board, if it shall be made within three weeks of the date of filing said application." It is, perhaps, fairly to be inferred from this clause that the framers of the law contemplated that the decision of the Board would be rendered within the same period of three weeks. But in two cases already the time has been extended by agreement of parties, at the request of the Board; and it requires no great foresight to predict that proper regard for the convenience of parties, as well as a full consideration of the important matters of business submitted, will often require the expenditure of more time than is contemplated by the existing provisions of law. It must, of course, be assumed that action will be as prompt as the nature of the case and other engagements will permit; but it is submitted that, for the reasons indicated above, it would be expedient either to abolish the limit of time altogether or to extend it to six weeks, at least.

4. It is further recommended that the Board be empowered to dispense with the public notice and public hearing required by the statute, whenever a request in writing to that effect is signed and presented by both parties to the controversy, or by their duly authorized agents. It is not difficult to conceive of cases in which a public hearing would not serve any useful purpose, but might deter parties from seeking aid and advice which under more favorable circumstances would have been deemed a real assistance in the prosecution of their business or the redress of grievances.

5. The compensation provided by the statute for the services of the Board was, of necessity, fixed without the aid of actual experience concerning the character and extent of the duties likely to devolve in practice upon such a tribunal. The Board begs leave to suggest that the section relating to this subject be reconsidered, and such amendments made as may seem just and appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTON LEWIS.

RICHARD P. BARRY.

CHARLES H. WALCOTT.



